

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In accordance with the provisions of the Massachusetts General laws, Chapter 30A, Section 20, notice is hereby given for the following meeting of the:

**Arlington School Committee
School Committee Special Meeting
Monday, May 9, 2016
6:45 PM**

*Town Hall
Selectmen's Chambers, 2nd Floor
730 Massachusetts Avenue
Arlington, MA*

6:45 PM Open Meeting

6:45 PM Public Participation

6:55 PM School Enrollment Task Force Recommendation Discussion

7:35 PM Motion by School Committee

7:40 PM Co-Sponsor Human Rights Commission Event

- *Arlington - Building an Inclusive and Welcoming Community, on Tuesday, May 17th at 6:45 PM - 8:45 PM at Robbins Library, Community Room.*

Subcommittee & Liaison Reports & Announcements

- *Budget, Kirsi Allison-Ampe, MD. (Chair)*
- *Community Relations, Cindy Starks, (Chair)*
- *District Accountability, Curriculum/Instruction & Assessment, (CIAA)
Paul Schlichtman, (Chair)*
- *Facilities, Jeff Thielman (Chair)*
- *Policies & Procedures, Bill Hayner (Chair)*
- *School Enrollment Task Force, Bill Hayner, Cindy Starks, Jeff Thielman*
- *Warrant Committee, Bill Hayner*
- *School Liaisons Reports*
- *Announcements*

7:45 PM Adjournment

The listings of matters are those reasonably anticipated by the Chair, which may be discussed at the meeting. Not all items listed may in fact be discussed and other items not listed may also be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.

Stated times and time amounts, listed in parenthesis, are the estimated amount of time for that particular agenda item. Actual times may be shorter or longer depending on the time needed to fully explore the topic.

Submitted by Jennifer Susse, Chair



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

6:55 PM School Enrollment Task Force Recommendation Discussion

Summary:

ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
<input type="checkbox"/> Reference Material	Move_to_opt_for_the_Gibbs_SETF_Motion_5_9_2016.docx	Motion from SETF May 2, 2016 Meeting
<input type="checkbox"/> Budget Document	MEMO_AND_INCREMENTAL_COST.pdf	Kathy Incremental Costs for Gibbs Grade Configurations 4 28 2016
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommendations	Kathleen_Bodie_s_recommendation_Gibbs_vs_OMS.pdf	Kathy's memo on the Gibbs's Recommendation 4 14 2016
<input type="checkbox"/> Backup Material	Comparison_Middle_School_Options_4-11-16_6h_Grade_v_E_Arl_MS_at_Gibbs.xlsx	Comparison Chart Middle School 4 11 2016 all

Move to opt for the Gibbs, and to direct the school committee to take into serious account the financial issues that Al and Charlie have raised, and the educational recommendations that have been made by the experts at the Otttoson middle school.

Please advise as to emendations to this motion.



ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Office of the Superintendent
Arlington High School
P. O. Box 167
869 Massachusetts Avenue
Arlington, MA 02476-0002

Telephone
(781) 316-3500
Fax
(781) 316-3509

April 28, 2016

To: Arlington School Committee
From: Kathleen Bodie, Ed. D.
Regarding: Incremental Costs for Gibbs Grade Configurations

Gibbs School in FY19: Potential Grade Configurations and Incremental Costs

The attached spreadsheets share the incremental costs of using the Gibbs to solve our middle school enrollment challenges. Three scenarios present alternative grade configurations and staffing models for an eventual Gibbs School. Following are highlights on the characteristics of the three scenarios.

Sixth grade only model

- Four sixth grade clusters – smaller clusters than for grades 7 and 8 smooths transition from elementary school model
- Replicate all sixth grade substantially separate programs, in addition to co-taught and inclusion programming
- Effective small group special education instruction given focus on sixth grade
- Limited World Language offerings – only two languages in sixth grade
- Most cost effective model
- Highest degree of parity with current Ottoson Middle School programming

Full Staffing Grades Six through Eight Model

- Four clusters, two of which are mixed grade clusters. One potential cluster breakdown is:
 - Sixth grade cluster
 - Sixth/seventh grade cluster
 - Seventh/eighth grade cluster
 - Eighth grade cluster
- No substantially separate programs
- Full staffing of special education co-taught and inclusion program
- Full staffing of specialist subjects
- Second highest degree of parity with current Ottoson Middle School model

Lower Staffing Grades Six through Eight Model

- Four clusters, two of which are mixed grade clusters. One potential cluster breakdown is:
 - Sixth grade cluster
 - Sixth/seventh grade cluster
 - Seventh/eighth grade cluster
 - Eighth grade cluster
- No substantially separate special education programs
- Full staffing of special education co-taught and inclusion program
- Lower staffing of specialist subjects
- Lowest degree of parity with current Ottoson Middle School model

Comparing Full and Lower Staffing Grades Six through Eight

- **Full staffing** preserves integrity of current cluster model. Arlington has determined that the cluster model is the best educational model for this age group; Arlington provides clusters at middle school level, not elementary or high school level
 - Full specialist staffing provides parity with current Ottoson Middle School model in scheduling flexibility to maintain common planning time for cluster teachers
 - Common planning time for cluster teachers focuses on coordinating teaching of cross-curricular skills and sharing knowledge of social emotional growth of students - key benefits of cluster model
- In addition, math intervention continues to be targeted at grade level work as the schedule allows grade level groupings
- **Lower staffing** model reduces integrity of cluster model
 - Lower specialist staffing reduces scheduling flexibility
 - Inability to ensure cluster teacher common planning time
- Math intervention may return to mixed grade cohorts, reducing ability to focus on grade level skill building

Average teacher salary FY19	77,338	Assumes 4% annual increase in average teacher salary
TA salary FY19	18,041	Assumes 2% annual increase in TA salary
BSP Salary FY19	26,289	Assumes 2% annual increase in BSP salary

Assumes 4 Sixth Grade Clusters

6th Grade Only

Gibbs Position	FTE	Cost	Ottoson reduction	FTE	Cost	Net change FTE	Net Change	Cost
Principal	1	125,000	Assistant Principal	1	92,860	0	32,140	
Secretary	1	62,124	Secretary	1	62,124	0	-	
Building Subs	2	36,082	Building Subs	1.5	27,062	0.5	9,021	
Nurse	1	77,338	Nurse	1	77,338	0	-	
In House suspension	1	26,289	In house suspension	0	-	1	26,289	
Library	1	21,062	Library	0	-	1	21,062	
Instructional Tech Support	0.6	46,403	Instructional Tech Support	0	-	0.6	46,403	
Traffic Supervisor	1	8,964	Traffic Supervisor	0	-	1	8,964	
English	4	309,352	English	3.5	270,683	0.5	38,669	
Math	4	309,352	Math	3.5	270,683	0.5	38,669	
Science	4	309,352	Science	3.5	270,683	0.5	38,669	
Social Studies	4	309,352	Social Studies	3.5	270,683	0.5	38,669	
Guidance/ Social Worker	2	154,676	Guidance/ Social Worker	1	77,338	1	77,338	
English Language Learner	0.5	38,669	English Language Learner	0	-	0.5	38,669	
Math Intervention	1	77,338	Math Intervention	1	77,338	0	-	
Reading Intervention	0.7	54,137	Reading Intervention	0.7	54,137	0	-	
Art	1	77,338	Art	0.6	46,403	0.4	30,935	
Music	1	77,338	Music	1	77,338	0	-	
FACS	1	77,338	FACS	1	77,338	0	-	
Physical Education	1.5	116,007	Physical Education	1.5	116,007	0	-	
Digital Modeling Lab	2.4	185,611	Technology Education	2.4	185,611	0	-	
Technology Engineering	1	77,338	Technology Engineering	1	77,338	0	-	
World Language	2	154,676	World Language	2	154,676	0	-	
Psychologists	1	77,338	Psychologists	1	77,338	0	-	
SpEd Co-taught	1	77,338	SpEd Co-taught	1	77,338	0	-	
SpEd Co-taught TA	1	18,041	SpEd Co-taught TA	1	18,041	0	-	
SpEd Inclusion	2	154,676	SpEd Inclusion	2	154,676	0	-	
SpEd Inclusion TA	2	36,082	SpEd Inclusion TA	2	36,082	0	-	
SLC-A (Reach)	1	77,338	SLC-A (Reach)	0.5	38,669	0.5	38,669	
SLC-A (Reach) BSP	1	26,289	SLC-A (Reach) BSP	1	26,289	0	-	
SLC-B (Summit)	1	77,338	SLC-B (Summit)	0	-	1	77,338	

Average teacher salary FY19	77,338	Assumes 4% annual increase in average teacher salary
TA salary FY19	18,041	Assumes 2% annual increase in TA salary
BSP Salary FY19	26,289	Assumes 2% annual increase in BSP salary

Assumes 4 Sixth Grade Clusters

6th Grade Only

Gibbs Position	FTE	Cost	Ottoson reduction	FTE	Cost	Net change FTE	Net Change	Cost
SLC-B (Summit) BSP	1	26,289	SLC-B (Summit) BSP	1	26,289	0	-	
SLC-C (Compass)	1	77,338	SLC-C (Compass)	0	-	1	77,338	
SLC-C (Compass) TA	1	18,041	SLC-C (Compass) TA	1	18,041	0	-	
SpEd Social Worker	1	77,338	SpEd Social Worker	0.5	38,669	0.5	38,669	
SpEd Occupational Therapist	0.4	30,935	SpEd Occupational Therapist	0.2	15,468	0.2	15,468	
SpEd Physical Therapist	0.2	15,468	SpEd Physical Therapist	0	-	0.2	15,468	
Speech/Language Pathologist	0.4	30,935	Speech/Language Pathologist	0	-	0.4	30,935	
Total Incremental increase in FY19						11.8	739,381	

Average teacher salary FY19	77,338	Assumes 4% annual increase in average teacher salary
TA salary FY19	18,041	Assumes 2% annual increase in TA salary
BSP Salary FY19	26,289	Assumes 2% annual increase in BSP salary

Assumes 4 Clusters

6th-8th Grade Fully Staffed

Gibbs Position	FTE	Cost	Ottoson reduction	FTE	Cost	net change FTE	Net Change	Cost
Principal	1	125,000	Assistant Principal	1	92,860	0	32,140	
Secretary	1	62,124	Secretary	1	62,124	0	-	
Building Subs	1.5	27,062	Building Subs	1.5	27,062	0	-	
Nurse	1	77,338	Nurse	1	77,338	0	-	
In House suspension	1	26,289	In house suspension	0	-	1	26,289	
Library	1	21,062	Library	0	-	1	21,062	
Instructional Tech Support	0.6	46,403	Instructional Tech Support	0	-	0.6	46,403	
Traffic Supervisor	1	8,964	Traffic Supervisor	0	-	1	8,964	
English	4	309,352	English	3.5	270,683	0.5	38,669	
Math	4	309,352	Math	3.5	270,683	0.5	38,669	
Science	4	309,352	Science	3.5	270,683	0.5	38,669	
Social Studies	4	309,352	Social Studies	3.5	270,683	0.5	38,669	
Guidance/ Social Worker	2	154,676	Guidance	1	77,338	1	77,338	
English Language Learner	1	77,338	English Language Learner	0	-	1	77,338	
Math Intervention	1.5	116,007	Math Intervention	1	77,338	0.5	38,669	
Reading Intervention	1	77,338	Reading Intervention	0.7	54,137	0.3	23,201	
Music	1.5	116,007	Music	1	77,338	0.5	38,669	
Physical Education	2.5	193,345	Physical Education	1	77,338	1.5	116,007	
Technology Engineering	1	77,338	Technology Engineering	1	77,338	0	-	
Digital Modeling Lab	0.5	38,669	Digital Modeling Lab	0.5	38,669	0	-	
FACS	1.5	116,007	FACS	0.6	46,403	0.9	69,604	
Art	1.5	116,007	Art	0.6	46,403	0.9	69,604	
World Language	3	232,014	World Language	2	154,676	1	77,338	
Psychologists	1	77,338	Psychologists	0.5	38,669	0.5	38,669	
SpEd Co-taught	3	232,014	SpEd Co-taught	0	-	3	232,014	
SpEd Co-taught TA	3	54,123	SpEd Co-taught TA	0	-	3	54,123	
SpEd Inclusion	3	232,014	SpEd Inclusion	1.5	116,007	1.5	116,007	
SpEd Inclusion TA	3	54,123	SpEd Inclusion TA	1.5	27,062	1.5	27,062	
SLC-A (Reach)	0	-	SLC-A (Reach)	0	-	0	-	
SLC-A (Reach) BSP	0	-	SLC-A (Reach) BSP	0	-	0	-	
SLC-B (Summit)	0	-	SLC-B (Summit)	0	-	0	-	

Average teacher salary FY19	77,338	Assumes 4% annual increase in average teacher salary
TA salary FY19	18,041	Assumes 2% annual increase in TA salary
BSP Salary FY19	26,289	Assumes 2% annual increase in BSP salary

Assumes 4 Clusters

6th-8th Grade Fully Staffed

Gibbs Position	FTE	Cost	Ottoson reduction	FTE	Cost	net change FTE	Net Change	Cost
SLC-B (Summit) BSP	0	-	SLC-B (Summit) BSP	0	-	0	-	-
SLC-C (Compass)	0	-	SLC-C (Compass)	0	-	0	-	-
SLC-C (Compass) TA	0	-	SLC-C (Compass) TA	0	-	0	-	-
SpEd Social Worker	1	77,338	SpEd Social Worker	0.5	38,669	0.5	38,669	
SpEd Occupational Therapist	0.2	15,468	SpEd Occupational Therapist	0	-	0.2	15,468	
SpEd Physical Therapist	0.2	15,468	SpEd Physical Therapist	0	-	0.2	15,468	
Speech/Language Pathologist	0.4	30,935	Speech/Language Pathologist	0	-	0.4	30,935	
Total Incremental increase in FY19						24	1,445,716	

Average teacher salary FY19	77,338	Assumes 4% annual increase in average teacher salary
TA salary FY19	18,041	Assumes 2% annual increase in TA salary
BSP Salary FY19	26,289	Assumes 2% annual increase in BSP salary

Assumes 4 Clusters

6th-8th Grade Lower Staff

Gibbs Position	FTE	Cost	Ottoson reduction	FTE	Cost	net change FTE	Net Change	Cost
Principal	1	125,000	Assistant Principal	1	92,860	0	32,140	
Secretary	1	62,124	Secretary	1	62,124	0	-	
Building Subs	1.5	27,062	Building Subs	1.5	27,062	0	-	
Nurse	1	77,338	Nurse	1	77,338	0	-	
In House suspension	1	26,289	In house suspension	0	-	1	26,289	
Library	1	21,062	Library	0	-	1	21,062	
Instructional Tech Support	0.6	46,403	Instructional Tech Support	0	-	0.6	46,403	
Traffic Supervisor	1	8,964	Traffic Supervisor	0	-	1	8,964	
English	4	309,352	English	3.5	270,683	0.5	38,669	
Math	4	309,352	Math	3.5	270,683	0.5	38,669	
Science	4	309,352	Science	3.5	270,683	0.5	38,669	
Social Studies	4	309,352	Social Studies	3.5	270,683	0.5	38,669	
Guidance/ Social Worker	2	154,676	Guidance	1	77,338	1	77,338	
English Language Learner	1	77,338	English Language Learner	0	-	1	77,338	
Math Intervention	1	77,338	Math Intervention	1	77,338	0	-	
Reading Intervention	1	77,338	Reading Intervention	0.7	54,137	0.3	23,201	
Music	1	77,338	Music	1	77,338	0	-	
Physical Education	1.5	116,007	Physical Education	1	77,338	0.5	38,669	
Technology Engineering	1	77,338	Technology Engineering	1	77,338	0	-	
Digital Modeling Lab	0.5	38,669	Digital Modeling Lab	0.5	38,669	0	-	
FACS	1	77,338	FACS	0.6	46,403	0.4	30,935	
Art	1	77,338	Art	0.6	46,403	0.4	30,935	
World Language	3	232,014	World Language	2	154,676	1	77,338	
Psychologists	1	77,338	Psychologists	0.5	38,669	0.5	38,669	
SpEd Co-taught	3	232,014	SpEd Co-taught	0	-	3	232,014	
SpEd Co-taught TA	3	54,123	SpEd Co-taught TA	0	-	3	54,123	
SpEd Inclusion	3	232,014	SpEd Inclusion	1.5	116,007	1.5	116,007	
SpEd Inclusion TA	3	54,123	SpEd Inclusion TA	1.5	27,062	1.5	27,062	
SLC-A (Reach)	0	-	SLC-A (Reach)	0	-	0	-	
SLC-A (Reach) BSP	0	-	SLC-A (Reach) BSP	0	-	0	-	
SLC-B (Summit)	0	-	SLC-B (Summit)	0	-	0	-	

Average teacher salary FY19	77,338	Assumes 4% annual increase in average teacher salary
TA salary FY19	18,041	Assumes 2% annual increase in TA salary
BSP Salary FY19	26,289	Assumes 2% annual increase in BSP salary

Assumes 4 Clusters

6th-8th Grade Lower Staff

Gibbs Position	FTE	Cost	Ottoson reduction	FTE	Cost	net change FTE	Net Change	Cost
SLC-B (Summit) BSP	0	-	SLC-B (Summit) BSP	0	-	0	-	-
SLC-C (Compass)	0	-	SLC-C (Compass)	0	-	0	-	-
SLC-C (Compass) TA	0	-	SLC-C (Compass) TA	0	-	0	-	-
SpEd Social Worker	1	77,338	SpEd Social Worker	0.5	38,669	0.5	38,669	
SpEd Occupational Therapist	0.2	15,468	SpEd Occupational Therapist	0	-	0.2	15,468	
SpEd Physical Therapist	0.2	15,468	SpEd Physical Therapist	0	-	0.2	15,468	
Speech/Language Pathologist	0.4	30,935	Speech/Language Pathologist	0	-	0.4	30,935	
Total Incremental increase in FY19						21	1,213,702	

Assumes 4 Clusters

6th-8th Grade Range of Expenses

Gibbs Positions Full	FTE	Cost	Gibbs Positions Lower	FTE	Cost
Math Intervention	1.5	116,007	Math Intervention	1	77,338
Music	1.5	116,007	Music	1	77,338
Physical Education	2.5	193,345	Physical Education	1.5	116,007
FACS	1.5	116,007	FACS	1	77,338
Art	1.5	116,007	Art	1	77,338
Totals	8.5	657,373		5.5	425,359
Difference	3	232,014			

Average Teacher salary calculation

	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19
Average Teachers Salary	62,294	63,945	65,963	68,571	71,503	74,363	77,338
Percent increase from prior year		2.65%	3.16%	3.95%	4.28%	4.00%	4.00%
TA					17,340	17,687	18,041
BSP					25,268	25,773	26,289
					2%	2%	2%



ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Office of the Superintendent
Arlington High School
P. O. Box 167
869 Massachusetts Avenue
Arlington, MA 02476-0002

Telephone
(781) 316-3500

Fax
(781) 316-3509

April 10, 2016

To: School Committee
From: Kathleen Bodie, Ed.D.
Re: Recommendation Regarding Gibbs or OMS Addition

While recognizing there are other issues (including fiscal concerns) that must be considered in a decision to either renovate the Gibbs School or build an addition to the Ottoson Middle School, my recommendation based on the educational effect of a large middle school on student well-being and learning is to bring the Gibbs building back into service for the Arlington Public Schools.

While the research on the effect of school size on student achievement is fairly inconclusive, in part because few studies have been conducted, research has shown, however, that there is a relationship between feeling connected to school and academic performance, behavior and health. In smaller schools students are more likely to feel part of the school culture and develop strong relationships both with teachers and peers. While I am confident that we will maintain a strong academic program for our middle school students regardless of whether they attend a larger Ottoson Middle School or a smaller Gibbs and Ottoson, I think that a smaller school environment will help support feelings of connectivity and help mitigate the stress many students feel presently, evidenced by more students reporting anxiety, increased student visits to the nurse, and more hospitalizations for anxiety.

The increase in student anxiety we are seeing at all levels K-12 is a phenomena that is being reported in many school districts. When students feel generalized anxiety, this feeling can and does interfere with learning. One study shows that "emotions can facilitate or impede children's academic engagement, work ethic, commitment, and ultimate school success. Because relationships and emotional processes affect how and what we learn, schools and families must effectively address these aspects of the educational process for the benefit of all students." (Elias et al., 1997) There is ample evidence in many studies over the last decade that show that students learn best in classrooms and schools where the environment provides a good academic-social-emotional balance. While achieving this important balance is possible in large schools, it is easier to achieve in smaller schools.

In the Arlington Public Schools, our focus to support the social-emotional well-being of students motivated the decision to have a social worker in every school. We have developed advisory

programs at both the middle and high schools and we provide, for example, responsive classroom training for elementary teachers, the “Helping Traumatized Students” course, and training for teachers in crisis care. We chose the Tools of the Mind program for Kindergarten to help our young students develop the self-management, decision-making, and social skills needed as a foundation for learning and, ultimately, success in life. Our goal for Kindergarten students is the same for all students no matter their age.

Yet, even with these efforts we still are seeing too many students exhibiting anxiety. While there is no certainty we will see a decrease in student anxiety with the choice for two smaller middle school environments, our experience as educators and research in this area suggests that we will.

Given the expected enrollment growth in our middle school over the next five to ten years, we must find additional space to meet the educational needs of this growing population of students. We have a choice between two options. The choice for an addition to the existing middle school creates an even more labyrinthine building that may affect students’ feeling of connection to and comfort in their school environment. Difficulty with navigating an even larger building will likely cause some students increased stress. We know that many sixth grade students now feel stress navigating the building for several months of their first year at OMS.

Choosing smaller schools for our middle school students rather than one large school does have program implications that are described in the accompanying chart. However, on balance, I still think that the benefits of having smaller, more scaled learning environments offset programmatic changes or losses that would occur.

Additionally, the recommendation to choose Gibbs rather than an addition to OMS is based on my assessment that Gibbs provides the school system and community with a more flexible alternative for future educational decisions.



Footnote:

Elias, M. J., Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Frey, K. S., Greenberg, M. T., Haynes, N. M., Kessler, R., SchwabStone, M. E., & Shriver, T. P. (1997). Promoting social and emotional learning: Guidelines for educators. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Expanding Ottoson Middle School v. Moving 6th Graders or East Arlington 6th, 7th and 8th Graders to Gibbs Educational Analysis of Each Option		
Gibbs Middle School (6th Grade or 6th, 7th, and 8th Grade school)	Factor	Ottoson Expansion
	<u>ASSUMPTIONS</u>	
500	Building Capacity	1,400
	<u>COMMUNITY CONSIDERATIONS</u>	
Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) analysis may be useful. Traffic will increase to East Arlington, but there would be a decrease in traffic to the Ottoson.	Traffic	Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) analysis of the increase in traffic to Ottoson with a population of 1400 students would be helpful.
Depends on the configuration. If 6th grade only, 6th graders from East Arlington will become walkers. Fewer walkers with the 6th grade option at Gibbs (most likely students from Thompson & Hardy, 155 of 500 kids or 30%). If we choose a 6-8 E. Arlington Middle School, nearly all students could walk to school.	Walkability	Remains the same - Same percentage of students who walk now would walk to the expanded facility.

<p>Smaller environment. Transition from 5th to 6th would be much better with the 6th Grade model. District could tailor a curriculum for 6th graders. With 6-8 model, Arlington would have a smaller middle school, and OMS would have fewer students in the building. 6th grade model allows for soft entrance to social emotional change that occurs at the middle school level. Scheduling may be more flexible with smaller populations.</p> <p>Gibbs likely will have more common spaces per student than an expanded OMS.</p>	School Culture	<p>Stress on common areas - gym, cafeteria, rest rooms etc. Common areas would need to be expanded to build community and allow for optimum programming. Adding more students to an already robust building will challenge the schedule. For example, OMS will need to add another lunch. Gym is used 6 out of 7 periods already. Musical programs have already outgrown their spaces. Staff don't know one another. Physical locations prohibit collegiality. Important to educate the public that simply adding an academic wing for one grade does not meet all of the building's challenges: school culture is determined by more than where one takes their core academic classrooms.</p>
<p>No change if Gibbs is a 6-8 school. Students in East Arlington will transition to 6th grade in same way their peers transition to OMS, though they will be transitioning to a school that is 50% smaller (population wise) than OMS. 6th grade school means one more transition (four schools per child in Arlington) for all APS students, but this does not seem to be an issue in a similar community with this model (Needham)</p>	School Transition	<p>Current culture of transition remains the same - all students go from 5th grade to 6th grade. APS students will have three transitions as they do currently.</p>

Not an issue with the 6th grade model. If 6-8 @ Gibbs, OMS will be the larger school with more resources and space. But, Gibbs will have recently renovated facilities and newer equipment. Similar curriculum.	Equity for all middle school students	Building spacious. Longer distances between cluster classrooms in addition and common spaces than clusters in older building and common spaces. Equipment and furniture more dated in older building than in addition. Similar curriculum.
	TEACHING AND LEARNING FACTORS	
Depending on the configuration there will still be four clusters at Gibbs. With a 6-8 grade model, 2 clusters will be split grade clusters.	Cluster Model	Addition would allow four clusters at each grade level.
Fewer language offering implications in either Gr. 6 or Gr. 6-8 configuration.	World Language Options (currently Spanish, French, Mandarin and Latin)	No change.
In Gr. 6-8 configuration, would require three levels of materials in the same classroom; teacher would teach all three levels. If Gr. 6 option, then teacher would teach one level.	Technology/Engineering	No change.
No change if Gr. 6 configuration. Possible change if current course extended to grades 7 & 8 and configuration is 6-8	Digital Modeling Lab (currently Gr. 6 course)	No change.
If Gr. 6, no change. If Gr. 6-8, likely curriculum impact because of equipment and three levels of resources in one classroom.	Family and Consumer Science	No change
If Gr. 6-8 configuration, no change. If Gr. 6, could have small class taking 7th gr. Math.	Opportunity to bypass 6th grade Math and enroll in 7th grade Math	No change.
Depends upon grade configuration.	ACE	No change

No change	Math, Science, ELA , Social Studies	No change
	<u>INSTRUCTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS</u>	
Depends on the configuration. Issues either horizontally or vertically.	Ability of teachers to meet with colleagues in other grades	No change
Depends on the configuration. Issues either horizontally or vertically.	Grade Level Meetings	No change
Depends on the configuration. Issues either horizontally or vertically.	Subject Level Meetings	No change
No change will meet within their building.	Full Staff Meetings	No change
May need to travel - more with 6 - 8 configuration than Gr. 6 option.	Availability of Specialists and Need to Travel	No change
Sufficient for 500 students.	Core spaces	May still feel overcrowded. Cannot have whole school together. Media center and cafeteria would have to be expanded. Music rooms would be overcrowded - may need additional room. Additional gym space needed.
Sufficient.	Room Ownership	Minimal change. Addition would free classroom space in existing building for expansion of out-of-cluster classroom spaces.
	<u>SPECIAL EDUCATION</u>	
Likely SLC students stay at OMS unless replicate programs. Gr. 6 students may have limited inclusion opportunities, if programs only at OMS. Content courses within SLC program. Traveling for OT, PT, S&L services.	What is the impact on Special Education Services? (OMS Expansion v. Gibbs 6th Grade Option)	No change

SLC students likely stay at OMS. Traveling for OT, PT, S&L services.	What is the impact on Special Education Services? (OMS Expansion v. Gibbs East Arlington 6-8 Middle School)	No change
Would likely keep programs at OMS. Challenge would be how Gr. 6 SLC students would have core class inclusion If at OMS (though not current norm for all students) -	What is the impact on Supported Learning Centers (SLCs)?	No change
	<u>IMPACT ON REMAINING STUDENTS AT OMS</u>	
More space at OMS so both schools better able to meet social and emotional needs of students. At OMS, could move 7th and 8th grades to own area of the building. Should feel more "community" in both buildings. Small school feel at Gibbs.	School Culture	More students in building. More challenging to manage. More stress. Longer distances to travel to class, affecting teaching and learning time. Less of a feeling of being connected to the whole school.
Impact different depending upon grade configuraton. For core academic classes, minimal effect. World language offerings potentially less in either configuration. ACE, instrumental music, chorus impacted.	Academic Impact	Increased travel time between classes will affect time on teaching and learning, particularly for Gr. 6.

<p>Music programs likely affected. Other after-school programs may be impacted.</p> <p>If programs offered at both schools, additional costs to replicate programs - for example, math team, basketball, NHC, robotics. Students may have to travel from one building to the other for some programs.</p>	<p>Extracurricular Programming</p>	<p>Same, but with increased numbers and crowding issues. Programs would have to expand for increased participation or limit access.</p>
	<p><u>EXTRACURRICULAR PROGRAMS</u></p>	
<p>May require traveling to other school or greater cost to replicate (assumes sufficient interest), or more limited options.</p>	<p>After School Programming (i.e., Robotics, Math Team, National History Day Competition)</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>If Gr. 6, would offer after-school program.</p>	<p>After School Program</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>May require traveling to other school if Gr. 6-8 configuration. If Gr. 6 configuration, have own after-school chorus which may require increased staffing costs.</p>	<p>Chorus</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>May require traveling to other school if Gr. 6-8 configuration. If Gr. 6 configuration, have own after-school band and orchestra, which will require increased staffing costs.</p>	<p>Instrumental Program</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Either Gr. 6 or Gr. 6-8 play. Increased stipend costs. Or, one middle school play at OMS. Gibbs students travel there.</p>	<p>Middle School Play</p>	<p>Fewer students able to participate as enrollment grows.</p>

	<u>SCHOOL CULTURE AND MANAGEMENT</u>	
Smaller school creates more connected and personalized school culture.	Which option creates the best overall culture for teaching and learning for Arlington Middle Schoolers?	While house system provides smaller school feeling to some extent, students still operate in a larger school climate because of shared core spaces and traveling to specialist rooms.
Increase of a Principal. Teacher to student ratios probably not affected unless additional teachers cannot be hired for enrollment growth due to budget constraints.	Which option presents the best teacher/administrator to student ratios?	Teacher to student ratios probably not affected unless additional teachers cannot be hired for enrollment growth due to budget constraints.
	OVERALL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT	
Smaller, more intimate educational setting is likely to lead to greater educational success even if current programmatic or extra-curricular offerings are more limited because of the impact of a more personal social-emotional climate. 6th Grade model offers a particularly attractive way to better prepare students for the next level of their education.	Which option is most likely to best prepare students for the next level of their education? Why?	Some students may not get as much attention in a larger school and may feel overwhelmed by the size of the school. Feeling "transitioned" to larger school may take more time than for a smaller school, which can affect achievement. Time on teaching and learning affected by travel time between cluster and out-of-cluster classes.
	<u>FINANCIAL ISSUES</u>	

<p>Incremental costs beyond costs due to enrollment growth. Incremental costs include a principal, school secretary, nurse, custodian, media center paraprofessional and additional staffing for social work, physical education, music, special education, ELL, specialists, world language, ACE, lunch, TAs. Impact to school budget. Incremental costs (without custodian) approximately \$580,000-680,000. Facility costs (heat, electricity, maintenance) will likely exceed cost of new addition.</p>	<p>What are the incremental operating costs under both models? How is this calculated?</p>	<p>Staff and material costs will increase in relationship to increased enrollment, including more stipends for extra-curricular activities. But, administration costs (principal and assistant principals) would not change. Increased facility costs for an addition - heat, electricity, and maintenance.</p>
<p>Cohort size could affect some staffing incremental costs, but not fixed costs (i.e. principal, secretary, nurse)</p>	<p>Is there a cost variance depending on student cohort sizes?</p>	<p>Cohort size may affect staffing costs, but not fixed staffing costs.</p>

Middle School Programming: All Town 6th Grade @ v. an East Arlington Middle School (Grades 6th, 7th, and 8th) @ Gibbs Pros and Cons of Each Option		
6th Grade at Gibbs	Factor	6th, 7th, 8th @ Gibbs (East Middle School)
	<u>ASSUMPTIONS</u>	
500	Building Capacity	500
500	6th Grade Capacity	166
494	Rising 6th Graders District Wide (Projected 10-year average)	494
	<u>COMMUNITY CONSIDERATIONS</u>	
Ask TAC study. TAC will need to know about staffing and drop-off. Would need 1 or two buses. Not necessarily an additive bus as 6th graders also get bussed now.	Traffic	Ask for TAC study. More walkers if 6/7/8 as most students will be local. May mean more traffic supervisors for walkers. Would eliminate need for bussing. TAC will need to know about staffing and drop-off.
Only 6th graders in E. Arlington would be walking 2/7.	Walkability	6/7/8 would be mostly walkers.
Teachers at OMS feel that this is the model that best supports school culture that supports learning. This model would provide a "polishing up" year. Some teachers expressed concerns that this model will increase transitions for students.	School Culture	School would have an intimate feel, but 50% smaller than OMS, and be a neighborhood middle school for East Arlington.
There will be one more transition (four schools per child in Arlington) for all APS students, but this does not seem to be an issue in a similar community with this model (Needham)	School Transition	Current culture of transition remains the same - all students go from 5th grade to 6th grade. APS students will have three transitions as they do currently.

Not an issue if the district opts for the 6th grade school.	Equity for all middle school students	A 6-8 school would be smaller than OMS, and some students would need to do after-school programming (orchestra, etc.) at OMS. There will be 1-2 fewer language offerings at Gibbs than OMS. It is possible that there could be fewer FACS offerings at Gibbs than OMS. It is also a possibility that ACE would be offered at OMS but not Gibbs. The percentage of co-taught classrooms may be different between the larger OMS and the smaller 6-8 Gibbs. 8th Graders at Gibbs will be going from a small group (166 or so students) to being part of a group of 400 9th graders at AHS. This may give an advantage in terms of assimilation to high school for those coming from OMS.
	TEACHING AND LEARNING FACTORS	
16 classrooms - 4 clusters	Cluster Model	1 sixth grade cluster, 1 sixth/seventh cluster, 1 seventh/eighth, 1 eight cluster - 4 cluster. 7th grade would not have a unique cluster.
We will likely offer two languages, and this would require an additional FTE and one language teacher would need to be certified in two languages. When they move to OMS they can move to a 4 language option. Opens up issues of language selection in 7th.	World Language Options (currently Spanish, French, Mandarin and Latin)	Probably could still have 2 languages, maybe 3 at the Gibbs, but at OMS you probably could offer 4 languages. Would have to make an educational decision whether to have inequity or cut back on languages.
6th grade curriculum is able to be moved easily.	Technology/Engineering	One person would have to teach all three levels. Equipment would have to be duplicated.
Easy to move to Gibbs	Digital Modeling Lab	Would have to duplicate labs at both schools

Easy to move to Gibbs	Family and Consumer Science	This would be a major curriculum upheaval; to have all of what is necessary to duplicate would be costly.
Would have a small math class for 6th graders eligible for 7th grade work.	Opportunity to bypass 6th grade Math and enroll in 7th grade Math	Could be done but scheduling will be challenging.
Would be hard to have in th 6th grade, but you could do part time.	ACE	Would either have to hire someone else - not a full FTE or not offer at Gibbs.
Teachers felt this best model.	Most conducive to teaching and learning and meeting social/emotional needs	Staff needed to be divided between schools
	INSTRUCTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS	
Tailored experience. Common planning time. School more accessible to parents to provide supports. Department meeting would be difficult have to travel.	Ability of teachers to meet with colleagues in other grades	Only able to meet with the subset of the grades. Common planning time okay. But meetings with department would be difficult.
Easier to have all in same grade.	Grade Level Meetings	Would have to travel.
Would have to travel.	Subject Level Meetings	Would have to travel.
Would happen the same.	Building Meetings	Would happen the same.
Probably have some people split - but less split.	Availability of Specialists and Need to Travel	More split with multi-grades
Class sizes would be relatively what they are now.	Class sizes	Depends on how you would district.
Same.	Core spaces	Same.
Classroom teachers own their classroom.	Room ownership	Classroom teachers own their own classroom.
	SPECIAL EDUCATION	
With grade 6 only co-taught easier.	What is the impact on Special Education Services under full inclusion model.	Having co-taught classrooms challenging.

Would keep those programs at OMS. Challenge would be how those SLC students would be in full inclusion if there is no 6th grade teachers.	What is the impact on Supported Learning Communities (SLCs)?	Each program is currently 6 - 7 - 8. We would keep that program at OMS.
All 7th and 8th Graders	IMPACT ON REMAINING STUDENTS AT OMS	Approximately 900 6th, 7th and 8th graders
Having smaller grade span is going to help with anxiety.	School Culture	Would have similar problems to what you have now.
	Academic Impact	
	Extracurricular Programming	
	EXTRACURRICULAR PROGRAMS	
CHallenging no matter which way. Coul have more programming for themselves. AM/PM programming would be okay.	After School Programming (i.e., Robotics, Math Team, National History Day Competition)	Challenging no matter which way. AM/PM might be difficult to have at two schools.
Since mostly 6th grade students would remain the same.	After School Program	Difficult to run two smaller program.s
Would have to go with 6th grade	Chorus	Would have to break it up, chorus is more flexible.
It depends on the break-out of the students. Could have 6th grade band and orchestra, Would probably have more staffing.	Instrumental Program	Then you might have to travel, by school, more personnel.
Could have both.	Middle School Play	Could have both.
	SCHOOL CULTURE AND MANAGEMENT	
The teachers at OMS believe this is the best model to support overall learning and school culture.	Which option creates the best overall culture for teaching and learning for Arlington Middle Schoolers?	The teachers at OMS believe this would be a less desirable model.

One administrator would be able to deal with one grade.	Which option presents the best teacher/administrator to student ratios?	One administrator would have to deal with multiple grades and developmental stages.
	OVERALL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT	
This model may well prepare students to be more successful at OMS 7/8 grade.	Which option is most likely to best prepare students for the next level of their education? Why?	This model may have negative effects for 8th grade students going from class of 166 to class of over 400.
	<u>FINANCIAL ISSUES</u>	
	What are the incremental operating costs under both models? How is this calculated?	
	Is there a cost variance depending on student cohort sizes?	



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

7:35 PM Motion by School Committee

ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Document for Approval	School_Committee_Motion_for_5_9_2016.pdf	Motion for 5 9 2016 School Committee

"The Arlington School Committee endorses the School Enrollment Task Force's vote on May 2, 2016, to accommodate the growth in the middle school-aged enrollment in Town by repurposing the Gibbs School as a middle school and the recommended vote of the Finance Committee that the Town appropriate and borrow the sum of \$2,550,000 for the architectural design, engineering, and project management of the Gibbs School building, contingent upon passage of a Proposition 2 1/2 debt exclusion referendum.

The School Committee further moves that, for the purpose of projecting incremental costs, the superintendent and the finance committee shall use costs associated with the configuration of the Gibbs School as a town wide sixth grade facility; and that the school committee would work within projected allocations if the committee decides to advance a model with two 6-8 grade middle schools.

The School Committee further directs the Superintendent to work with the Arlington Center for the Arts (ACA) to identify space that can be used for the ACA summer camp in 2017."



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

7:40 PM Co-Sponsor Human Rights Commission Event

Summary:

- Arlington - Building an Inclusive and Welcoming Community, on Tuesday, May 17th at 6:45 PM - 8:45 PM at Robbins Library, Community Room.

ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Document for Approval	HRC_Joint_co_sponsor_event.pdf	HRC event

The Arlington Human Rights Commission, in partnership with Facing History and Ourselves, invites you to an interactive Community Dialogue as we talk about "Arlington - Building an Inclusive and Welcoming Community." We will use text written by George Washington and video from Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie, author of "Americanah," Arlington's Community Read, to engage in a dialogue that uses our history as well as our present to inform our discussion around building an inclusive community in Arlington that welcomes all. Please join us on Tuesday May 17th from 6:45-8:45 p.m. at the Robbins Library Community Room. Light refreshments will be served.



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

Subcommittee & Liaison Reports & Announcements

Summary:

- *Budget, Kirsi Allison-Ampe, MD. (Chair)*
- *Community Relations, Cindy Starks, (Chair)*
- *District Accountability, Curriculum/Instruction & Assessment, (CIAA) Paul Schlichtman, (Chair)*
- *Facilities, Jeff Thielman (Chair)*
- *Policies & Procedures, Bill Hayner (Chair)*
- *School Enrollment Task Force, Bill Hayner, Cindy Starks, Jeff Thielman*
- *Warrant Committee, Bill Hayner*
- *School Liaisons Reports*
- *Announcements*

ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup Material	draft_minutes_from_5_6_2016_Budget_Subcommittee.pdf	Budget Subcommittee 05 06 2016 draft minutes

DRAFT MINUTES

Budget Subcommittee
Arlington School Committee

Meeting Minutes
Friday, May 6th, 2016, 5:00 p.m.

Attendance

Subcommittee Members: Kirsy Allison-Ampe M.D., Paul Schlichtman, Len Kardon

School Committee Members: Jeff Thielman, Bill Hayner

District Leadership: Kathleen Bodie, Ed.D., Laura Chesson, Ed.D., Diane Johnson, Julie Dunn

Finance Committee: Richard Fanning, Dean Carman

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

1. There was no public participation.
2. The subcommittee discussed Mr Foskett's Monday presentation to the School Enrollment Task Force and potential counter-analyses prepared by Dr Ampe.
 - It was pointed out that there is ambiguity in Dr Bodie's later analysis of additional positions that will be required at the Ottoson because of enrollment growth, and that this ambiguity potentially affects counter analysis results
 - The subcommittee could not quickly identify the source of the concern
 - Dr Ampe and Mr Kardon will separately examine the numbers more closely over the weekend seeking to clarify the uncertainty, and then make their decisions about what counter-analysis to communicate to FinCom
3. The motion forwarded by Dr Jennifer Susse, Chair of School Committee, listed below, was discussed. Mr Kardon felt it was inappropriate to make a decision on the configuration of the Gibbs School before having additional community input. Subcommittee members, administration and FinCom members did acknowledge the different financial impacts of the Grade 6 only vs the Grade 6-8 configurations. The subcommittee declined to take a stand on the motion.

"Moved that the Arlington School Committee endorses the School Enrollment Task Force's vote on May 2, 2016 to accommodate the growth in middle school-aged enrollment in Town by repurposing the Gibbs school as a middle school. Taking into account both educational and financial considerations, the Committee further moves that, conditioned upon a favorable vote of the Town's voters on June 14, 2016, to direct the Superintendent of Schools to take all appropriate steps to configure the future Gibbs Middle School as a Town-wide 6th Grade facility, with a Town-wide 7th-8th grade configuration at the Ottoson Middle School.

DRAFT MINUTES

The School Committee endeavors to keep the incremental costs of staffing the Gibbs 6th grade option from significantly impacting the existing long-range financial plan by asking that any Ch. 70 increases that exceed current projections for Ch. 70 in the long range plan be directed to funding Gibbs.

We endeavor to commit to this agreement until the Town commits to a new Long Range Plan as part of the next Proposition 2 ½ Override request to the voters of Arlington.”

4. The following motion was suggested by Mr Schlichtman, for discussion and potentially to recommend to the entire School Committee. Mr Thielman suggested the motion be amended to add a recommendation to the Superintendent to address ACA's need for summer camp space for 2017. This amendment was adopted. After discussion, the motion was moved to be recommended to the full School Committee by Mr Schlichtman, seconded by Mr Kardon. Motion passed 3-0.

“The Arlington School Committee endorses the School Enrollment Task Force's vote on May 2, 2016, to accommodate the growth in the middle school-aged enrollment in Town by repurposing the Gibbs School as a middle school and the recommended vote of the Finance Committee that the Town appropriate and borrow the sum of \$2,550,000 for the architectural design, engineering, and project management of the Gibbs School building, contingent upon passage of a Proposition 2 1/2 debt exclusion referendum.

The School Committee further moves that, for the purpose of projecting incremental costs, the superintendent and the finance committee shall use costs associated with the configuration of the Gibbs School as a townwide sixth grade facility; and that the school committee would work within projected allocations if the committee decides to advance a model with two 6-8 grade middle schools.

The School Committee further directs the Superintendent to work with the Arlington Center for the Arts (ACA) to identify space that can be used for the ACA summer camp in 2017.”

5. There were no financial proposals to discuss from FinCom.
6. The subcommittee discussed the additional \$171,000 in funding for FY17 that may result from expectations from higher Chapter 70 reimbursement to the town from the state. The decision was made to wait and see what the final figure was before further discussion on allocation.
7. Meeting adjourned at 6:30pm.



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

Submitted by Jennifer Susse, Chair